1–34

A Simple Homotopy Proximal Mapping Algorithm for Compressive Sensing

Tianbao Yang[†] TIANBAO-YANG@UIOWA.EDU
Lijun Zhang[‡] ZHANGLJ@LAMDA.NJU.EDU.CN
Rong Jin[♮] JINRONG.JR@ALIBABA-INC.COM
Shenghuo Zhu[♮] SHENGHUO@GMAIL.COM
Zhi-Hua Zhou[‡] ZHOUZH@LAMDA.NJU.EDU.CN
[†]*Department of Computer Science*
The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242
[‡]*National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology*
Nanjing University, Nanjing 210023, China
[♮]*Alibaba Group, Seattle, USA*

arXiv:1412.1205v4 [cs.IT] 26 Aug 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we present a novel yet simple homotopy proximal mapping algorithm for compressive sensing. The algorithm adopts a simple proximal mapping of the ℓ_1 norm at each iteration and gradually reduces the regularization parameter for the ℓ_1 norm. We prove a global linear convergence of the proposed homotopy proximal mapping (HPM) algorithm for solving compressive sensing under three different settings (i) sparse signal recovery under noiseless measurements, (ii) sparse signal recovery under noisy measurements, and (iii) nearly-sparse signal recovery under sub-gaussian noisy measurements. In particular, we show that when the measurement matrix satisfies Restricted Isometric Properties (RIP), our theoretical results in settings (i) and (ii) almost recover the best condition on the RIP constants for compressive sensing. In addition, in setting (iii), our results for sparse signal recovery are better than the previous results, and furthermore our analysis explicitly exhibits that more observations lead to not only more accurate recovery but also faster convergence. Compared with previous studies on linear convergence for sparse signal recovery, our algorithm is simple and efficient, and our results are better and provide more insights. Finally our empirical studies provide further support for the proposed homotopy proximal mapping algorithm and verify the theoretical results.

Keywords: Compressive Sensing, Sparse Signal Recovery, Proximal Mapping, Linear Convergence

1. Introduction

The problem of sparse signal recovery is to reconstruct a sparse signal given a number of linear measurements of the signal. The problem has been studied extensively in the literature related to compressive sensing (Candès and Wakin, 2008; Donoho, 2006) and model selection (Tibshirani, 1996; Efron et al., 2004; Kyrillidis and Cevher, 2012). Numerous algorithms and results have been developed for sparse signal recovery under different settings and different conditions. Let $\mathbf{x}_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote a target signal and $\mathbf{y} = U\mathbf{x}_* + \mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote $n < d$ measurements of $\mathbf{x}_*$, where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$ is a measurement matrix and $\mathbf{e}$ encodes potential noise in the observations. In the earliest studies of compressive sensing (Candès and Tao, 2005; Candès, 2008; Chen et al., 2001; Donoho and Tsaig,

© T. Yang, L. Zhang, R. Jin, S. Zhu & Z.-H. Zhou.

2008), the sparse signal recovery is cast into a linear programming problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \quad & \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \\ s.t. \quad & \|U\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|_2 \le \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

It was shown that when the measurement matrix U satisfies RIP with small RIP constants (c.f. the definition in **Definition 1**), the solution to (1) denoted by $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ can recover the sparse signal $\mathbf{x}_*$ up to the noise level $\|\mathbf{e}\|_2$. In their seminal work (Candès and Tao, 2005), Candès and Tao proved that when $\mathbf{e}=0$, i.e, there is no noise in the observations, $\mathbf{x}_*$ is the unique solution to (1) provided that RIP constants of U satisfy $\delta_s+\delta_{2s}+\delta_{3s}<1$. The recovery result was later generalized to a more general setting of nearly-sparse signal recovery with noisy observations, under the condition $\delta_{2s}\le\sqrt{2}-1$ and $\epsilon\ge\|\mathbf{e}\|_2$ (Candès, 2008). Similar recovery results have been obtained for the Dantzig selector (Candès and Tao, 2007):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \quad & \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \\ s.t. \quad & \|U^\top(U\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\|_\infty \le \lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

by setting $\lambda\ge\|U^\top\mathbf{e}\|_\infty$. The sparse signal recovery is also closely related to the basis pursuit denoising problem (BPDN) (Chen et al., 1998), which aims to solve the following unconstrained ℓ_1 regularized least-squares minimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \quad \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\|U\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|_2^2}_{f(\mathbf{x})}+\lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|_1, \tag{3}$$

where λ is a regularization parameter. Various properties of the optimal solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ to (3) have been investigated (Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006; Tropp, 2006b; Zhao and Yu, 2006; Zhang and Huang, 2008; Zhang, 2009; Bickel et al., 2009; van de Geer and Bühlmann, 2009; Wainwright, 2009). In particular, it is known that under RIP for U, as long as $\lambda>c\|U^\top\mathbf{e}\|_\infty$, where c is a universal constant, the optimal solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ to (3) can recover a s-sparse signal $\mathbf{x}_*$ up to the noise level.

In this paper, we study the problem of sparse signal recovery by directly analyzing the convergence of a new optimization algorithm, namely the homotopy proximal mapping algorithm. The algorithm adopts a proximal mapping for the ℓ_1 norm regularization at each iteration:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1}=\arg\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{1}{2}\left\|\mathbf{x}-\left(\mathbf{x}_t-U^\top(U\mathbf{x}_t-\mathbf{y})\right)\right\|_2^2+\lambda_t\|\mathbf{x}\|_1,$$

with a gradually reduced regularization parameter λ_t. It is also known that the proximal mapping above is one proximal gradient step for solving (3) with λ_t, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{t+1} &= \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2+\left[f(\mathbf{x}_t)+(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_t)^\top\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\right]+\lambda_t\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \\ &= \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2+\mathbf{x}^\top U^\top(U\mathbf{x}_t-\mathbf{y})+\lambda_t\|\mathbf{x}\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

where the terms in the square bracket can be considered as a Taylor expansion of $f(\mathbf{x})$ around $\mathbf{x}_t$. We prove that under RIP conditions for U the solution $\mathbf{x}_t$ will converge **linearly** to a solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ that recovers the sparse signal up to the noise level. In particular, we establish the convergence results in three settings. In the following presentation, we let $\mathbf{x}^s$ denote the vector $\mathbf{x}$ with all but the s-largest entries (in magnitude) set to zero.

Setting I: Sparse signal recovery under noiseless observations. For any s-sparse vector $\mathbf{x}_*$, if $\mathbf{e} = 0$ and U satisfies RIP such that

$$\gamma = \delta_s + \sqrt{2}\delta_{2s} + \delta_{3s} < 1, \tag{4}$$

then the sequence $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ can converge linearly to $\mathbf{x}_*$, e.g.,

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \gamma^t \Delta_1,$$

where Δ_1 is an upper bound of $\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$.

Setting II: Sparse signal recovery under noisy observations. For any s-sparse vector $\mathbf{x}_*$, if U satisfies RIP such that (4) holds, then $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ can converge linearly to a solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ that recovers $\mathbf{x}_*$ up to the noise level, e.g.,

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \gamma^t \Delta_1 + \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{1-\gamma}\sqrt{s}\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty,$$

where γ is given in (4).

Setting III: Nearly sparse signal recovery under a sub-gaussian measurement matrix U. For a fixed vector $\mathbf{x}_*$, with a probability $1 - 2te^{-\tau}$, $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ can converge linearly to a solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ that recovers $\mathbf{x}_*^s$ up to the noise level, e.g.,

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \gamma^t \Delta_1 + \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{1-\gamma}\Lambda, \tag{5}$$

where $\gamma = (1+\sqrt{2})\eta < 1$ with η and Λ satisfying

$$\eta \geq c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log[d/s]}{n}},$$
$$\Lambda = \sqrt{s}\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty + c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log[d/s]}{n}}\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 + c\|(\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s)^s\|_2,$$

where c is a universal constant.

In addition, in all three settings considered above we show that $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_t) \setminus \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_*^s)| \leq s$, where $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the support set of $\mathbf{x}$, which implies that the number of non-zero elements beyond $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_*^s)$ is no more than s.

We note that the results in Settings I and II of the proposed algorithm hinge on appropriately setting the sequence of regularization parameters λ_t that depend on the RIP constants. In Setting III, we develop a more practical algorithm with no algorithmic dependence on the RIP constants. However, it is notable that Setting III is under a weaker model where the result only holds for a fixed vector $\mathbf{x}_*$ unlike that Settings I and II apply to any sparse vector $\mathbf{x}_*$. Indeed, the result in Setting III holds for any Johnson-Lindenstrauss (JL) transforms that satisfy the JL lemma (Johnson and Lindenstrauss, 1984) and the high probability is with respect to the randomness in the measurement matrix. In Section II, we briefly discuss the above results in comparison with previous work.

2. Related Work

We first compare our recovery results with state of the art results for (nearly) sparse signal recovery and then discuss about the optimization algorithms for sparse signal recovery.

Sparse signal recovery with noiseless observations Candès and Tao (2005) analyzed the recovery result for solving the ℓ_1 minimization problem (1) with noiseless observations $\mathbf{y} = U\mathbf{x}_*$, and showed that for any s-sparse signal $\mathbf{x}_*$ when U satisfies RIP [1] such that

$$\delta_s + \delta_{2s} + \delta_{3s} < 1, \tag{6}$$

then the optimal solution to (1) with $\epsilon = 0$ is unique and is equal to $\mathbf{x}_*$. Comparing the inequality (4) and (6), our condition for exact recovery is close to the above condition. The exact recovery was also indicated in Candès' later work (Candès, 2008) but with a slightly different RIP condition $\delta_{2s} \leq \sqrt{2} - 1$.

Sparse signal recovery with noisy observations Candès (2008) proved a recovery result for noisy observations. For any s-sparse vector $\mathbf{x}_*$, when U satisfies RIP such that $\delta_{2s} \leq \sqrt{2} - 1$, the optimal solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ to (1) by setting $\epsilon \geq \|\mathbf{e}\|_2$ obeys

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq C_2\epsilon,$$

where C_2 is a constant depending on δ_{2s}. In comparison, our recovery error in **Setting II** depends on $\sqrt{s}\|U\mathbf{e}\|_\infty$ which could be smaller than $\|\mathbf{e}\|_2$ (e.g., when the entries in U are sub-gaussian as stated in Proposition 6 in the appendix).

Nearly sparse signal recovery with noisy observations A more general recovery result was also established in (Candès, 2008). For any vector $\mathbf{x}_*$, when U satisfies RIP such that $\delta_{2s} \leq \sqrt{2}-1$, the optimal solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ to (1) by setting $\epsilon \geq \|\mathbf{e}\|_2$ obeys

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq C_0\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_1}{\sqrt{s}} + C_2\epsilon,$$

where C_0 is a constant depending on δ_{2s}. Similar results have also been developed for the Dantzig selector (2). Namely, when the RIP constant δ_{2s} of U satisfies $\delta_{2s} \leq \sqrt{2} - 1$, the optimal solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ to (2) by setting $\lambda \geq \|U^\top\mathbf{e}\|_\infty$ satisfies

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq C_0\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_1}{\sqrt{s}} + C_3\sqrt{s}\lambda,$$

where C_3 is a constant depending on δ_{2s}. In contrast, in **Setting III**, we established a better recovery result for a fixed signal $\mathbf{x}_*$. From (5), we can see that the full recovery error $\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$ depends on the ℓ_2 norm $\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$ instead of $\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_1/\sqrt{s}$.

It is worth mentioning that there exist a battery of studies on establishing sharper conditions on the RIP constants for exact or accurate recovery (see (Cai and Zhang, 2014) and references therein). Cai and Zhang (2014) established sharpest condition on the RIP constant δ_{ts} for $t \geq$

1. Using the restricted orthogonality constant $\theta_{s,s'}$ defined in **Definition 2**, a better condition on RIP constants can be established in their result as well as in our analysis. We use the restricted isometry constant δ_s in order to compare with other works and benefit from previous methods that estimate δ_s.

4/3. In particular, they show that $\delta_{ts} \leq \sqrt{\frac{t-1}{t}}$ for $t \geq 4/3$ is sufficient for exact recovery under noiseless measurements and accurate recovery under noisy measurements. Nevertheless, we make no attempts to sharpen the condition on RIP constants but rather focus on the optimization algorithms and their recovery properties.

Instance-level recovery result A weaker recovery result is that given a fixed signal $\mathbf{x}_*$, we can draw a random measurement matrix U and with a high probability expect certain performance for the recovery of the signal $\mathbf{x}_*$. We refer to this type of guarantee as instance-level recovery result (Eldar and Kutyniok, 2012). An advantage of the instance-level recovery is that we can achieve a recovery error in the form of $\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq C\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$ with C being a constant and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ being the recovered signal. However, such a result is impossible for any signal $\mathbf{x}_*$ without using a large number of observations, or in other words, such a result is only possible for any signal $\mathbf{x}_*$ when $n \geq cd$ for a constant $c > 0$ (i.e., $n = \Omega(d)$). In (Eldar and Kutyniok, 2012), it was shown that when the observations are free of noise and $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$ is a sub-gaussian random matrix with $n = O(s\log(d/s)/\delta_{2s}^2)$, then for a fixed signal $\mathbf{x}_*$ with a probability $1 - 2\exp(-c_1\delta_{2s}^2 n) - \exp(c_0 n)$, the optimal solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ to (1) with $\epsilon = 2\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$ obeys

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq 2C_2\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2, \tag{7}$$

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq (2C_2 + 1)\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2, \tag{8}$$

where $C_2 > 4$ is a constant depending on δ_{2s}. In contrast, our sparse signal recovery result for $\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$ in **Setting III** (considering no noise) is much better than that in (7) since the error is dominated by $O\left(\|(\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s)^s\|_2 + \sqrt{\frac{s\log[d/s]}{n}}\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2\right)$, where $\|(\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s)^s\|_2$ is the ℓ_2 norm of the largest s elements in $\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s$. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first such result in the literature.

There are also many studies on analyzing the properties of the optimal solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ to the ℓ_1 regularized minimization problem in (3) (Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006; Tropp, 2006b; Zhao and Yu, 2006; Zhang and Huang, 2008; Zhang, 2009; Bickel et al., 2009; van de Geer and Bühlmann, 2009; Wainwright, 2009). It is known that under RIP condition for U and $\lambda > c\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$ (for some universal constant c), we can obtain a recovery bound for any s-sparse signal $\mathbf{x}_*$

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{s}\lambda).$$

In comparison, our analysis also exhibits that the final value of λ_t is $\Omega(\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty)$ for sparse signal recovery. More literature on sparse signal recovery can be found in (Eldar and Kutyniok, 2012).

Optimization algorithms There have been extensive research on solving the ℓ_1 minimization problems in (1) and (2), and the ℓ_1 regularized minimization problem in (3). Various algorithms have been developed, including greedy algorithms (Davis et al., 2004; Tropp, 2006a; Needell and Tropp, 2010; Mallat and Zhang, 1993; Tropp and Gilbert, 2007; Donoho et al., 2012; Needell and Vershynin, 2009), interior-point methods (Chen et al., 2001; Turlach et al., 2005; Kim et al., 2008), proximal gradient methods (Nesterov, 2007; Tseng, 2008; Beck and Teboulle, 2009; Becker et al., 2011), exact homotopy path-following methods (Osborne et al., 2000, 1999; Efron et al., 2004), iterative hard-thresholding methods (Garg and Khandekar, 2009; Blumensath and Davies, 2009; Foucart, 2011; Kyrillidis and Cevher, 2014). In (Garg and Khandekar, 2009), the authors gave a nice review of the convergence rates and their computational costs for different optimization algorithms. Below, we focus on two classes of algorithms that are closely related to the proposed

work, with one employing the iterative hard-thresholding and the other exploiting the iterative soft-thresholding.

The hard-thresholding amounts to updating the solution based on the exact sparsification, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = H_s\left(\mathbf{x}_t - \frac{1}{\gamma}U^\top(U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y})\right),$$

where γ is a constant and $H_s(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^s$ is the hard-thresholding operator that gives the best s-sparse approximation of a vector x, i.e., setting all elements in $\mathbf{x}$ to zeros except for the s largest elements in magnitude. In (Blumensath and Davies, 2009), the authors analyzed the iterative hard-thresholding algorithm with $\gamma = 1$. They show that when U satisfies RIP with $\delta_{3s} < 1/\sqrt{32}$, the sequence $\{\mathbf{x}_t\}$ converges linearly to the best attainable solution up to a constant, i.e.,

$$\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq 2^{-t}\|\mathbf{x}_*\|_2 + 6\left[\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 + \|\mathbf{e}\|_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_1\right]. \tag{9}$$

Similarly, Garg and Khandekar (2009) analyzed the iterative hard-thresholding with $\gamma = 1 + \delta_{2s}$ under the **Settings I and II**, and showed the sequence $\{\mathbf{x}_t\}$ converges to a solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ that recovers any s-sparse signal $\mathbf{x}_*$ signal up to the noise level, i.e., $\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \frac{4}{1-\delta_{2s}}\|\mathbf{e}\|_2$ with a rate of $\left(\frac{8\delta_{2s}}{1-\delta_{2s}}\right)^t$ under the condition $\delta_{2s} \leq 1/3$. In contrast, the proposed algorithm in **Settings I and II** only requires $\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\delta_{2s} + \delta_{3s} < 1$, which is less restricted than $\delta_{3s} \leq 1/\sqrt{32}$ or $\delta_{2s} \leq 1/3$. In **Setting III**, we proved a recovery for a fixed signal $\mathbf{x}_*$ with a high probability. Comparing (5) and (9), we could see that the upper bound of the recovery of the proposed algorithm might be tighter than that of the iterative hard-thresholding algorithm, since our bound depends on $\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$ instead of $\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_1/\sqrt{s}$.

The iterative soft-thresholding algorithms (ISTA) are based on the proximal mapping of ℓ_1 regularization for solving the ℓ_1 regularized minimization problem (3), where the updates are given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \arg\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{x}^\top\nabla_t + \frac{\gamma_t}{2}\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|_1,$$

where ∇_t is set to the gradient of the square error w.r.t $\mathbf{x}_t$, and γ_t is a step size. The proximal mapping springs from Nesterov's first order method for composite optimization (Nesterov, 2007). In (Bredies and Lorenz, 2008; Hale et al., 2008), the authors studied the soft-thresholding update with a constant step size and established local linear convergence rates as the iterates are close enough to the optimum. There are several striking differences between ISTA and the proposed algorithms, including Algorithms 1, 2 and 3. First, ISTA solves exactly the ℓ_1 regularized least-squares problem (i.e., the BPDN problem) with a *fixed* regularization parameter. The proposed algorithms are proposed to directly reconstruct a sparse signal from noisy measurements. Second, if using the BPDN formulation to recover a sparse signal requires the algorithm needs to know the regularization parameter λ such that $\lambda \geq \Omega(\|U^\top\mathbf{e}\|_\infty)$. However, the proposed Algorithm 3 does not need any knowledge about the order of $\|U^\top\mathbf{e}\|_\infty$. Instead, it uses the proximal mapping of an ℓ_1 norm regularizer with a gradually decreasing regularization parameter λ_t until the solution exceeds the target sparsity by two times. Third, the proposed algorithms enjoy global linear convergence, while ISTA has only local linear convergence when the solution is close enough to the optimal solution. Last but not least, the presented algorithms and analysis provide a unified framework of

optimization and recovery of sparse signal. In contrast, ISTA is only an optimization algorithm which solely provides no guarantee on the recovery of underlying true sparse signal.

Recently, several algorithms exhibit global linear convergence for the BPDN problem. Agarwal et al. (2010) studied an optimization problem (3) for statistical recovery. They used a different update

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x}^\top \nabla_t + \frac{\gamma_u}{2}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|_1, \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq \rho\}$, and γ_u is a parameter related to the restricted smoothness of the loss function. They proved a global linear convergence of the above update with $\rho = \Theta(\|\mathbf{x}_*\|_1)$ for finding a solution up to the statistical tolerance. Xiao and Zhang (2013) studied a proximal-gradient homotopy gradient method for solving (3). They iteratively solve the problem (3) by the proximal gradient descent with a decreasing regularization parameter λ and an increasing accuracy at each stage, and use the solution obtained at each stage to warm start the next stage. A global linear convergence was also established.

Although there are many parallels between this work and (Agarwal et al., 2010; Xiao and Zhang, 2013), there are big differences. (i) The proposed work is dedicated to sparse signal recovery, exhibiting the conditions in different settings under which the recovery is optimal. (ii) Different from (Agarwal et al., 2010) that updates the solution using the constrained proximal mapping in (10), our algorithms solve a simple proximal mapping of the ℓ_1 norm regularization at each iteration. (iii) Different from (Xiao and Zhang, 2013) that updates the solution using a stage-wise proximal gradient descent with pesky parameters, the proposed homotopy proximal mapping algorithm is much simpler as well as the analysis. (iv) Our algorithm and analysis provide better guarantees for the solutions. First, both the convergence rates and the recovery error of the proposed algorithms are directly related to the RIP constants (in **Settings I and II**) or the number of observations (in **Setting III**), implying that more observations lead to not only more accurate recovery but also faster convergence. Second, our algorithm can guarantee that the support sets of the intermediate solutions do not exceed the target support set by s, the target sparsity. In contrast, (Agarwal et al., 2010) provides no explicit guarantee of sparsity bound for the intermediate solutions, and in (Xiao and Zhang, 2013) the support sets of the intermediate solutions beyond the target support set could be much larger than s.

3. Sparse Signal Recovery

3.1. Notations and Definitions

Let $\mathbf{x}_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a s-sparse high dimensional signal to be recovered, where the number of non-zero elements in $\mathbf{x}_*$ is s. We denote by $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{x})$ the support set for $\mathbf{x}$ that includes all the indices of the non-zero entries in $\mathbf{x}$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{x}) = \{i \in \{1,\ldots,d\} : [\mathbf{x}]_i \neq 0\}, \tag{11}$$

where $[\mathbf{x}]_i$ denote the i-th element in $\mathbf{x}$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}_1 \setminus \mathcal{S}_2$ a subset of $\mathcal{S}_1$ that contains all elements in $\mathcal{S}_1$ but not in $\mathcal{S}_2$. We also denote by $\overline{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = \{1,\ldots,d\} \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{x})$ the complementary set of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{x})$. In particular, we use $\mathcal{S}_*, \overline{\mathcal{S}}_*$ to denote the support set and its complementary set of $\mathbf{x}_*$. Let $|\mathcal{S}|$ denote the cardinality of $\mathcal{S}$, and let $\mathbf{x}^s \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with all but the s-largest entries (in magnitude) set to zero. Denote by $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$, $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$, $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0$ the ℓ_2, ℓ_1, ℓ_∞ and ℓ_0 norm, respectively.

Consider a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$. Given a set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{1,\ldots,d\}$, we denote by $[\mathbf{x}]_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ the vector that only includes the entries of $\mathbf{x}$ in the subset $\mathcal{S}$, and by $M_{\mathcal{S}}$ a sub-matrix that only contains the columns of M indexed by $\mathcal{S}$. Given two subsets $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{1,\ldots,d\}$ and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \{1,\ldots,d\}$, we denote by $[M]_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}$ a sub-matrix that includes all the entries (i,j) in matrix M with $i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $j \in \mathcal{B}$. $\|M\|_2$ denotes the spectral norm of a matrix M.

Let $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$ be a measurement matrix and

$$\mathbf{y} = U\mathbf{x}_* + \mathbf{e} \tag{12}$$

be the corresponding n observations of the target signal $\mathbf{x}_*$. Similar to most work in compressive sensing, we assume the measurement matrix U satisfies the following restricted isometry properties (RIP) (with an overwhelming probability).

Definition 1 (s-restricted isometry constant) *Let $\delta_s \geq 0$ be the smallest constant such that for any subset $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \{1,\ldots,d\}$ with $|\mathcal{T}| \leq s$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{T}|}$,*

$$(1-\delta_s)\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq \|U_{\mathcal{T}}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq (1+\delta_s)\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$$

where $U_{\mathcal{T}}$ denotes a sub-matrix of U with column indices from $\mathcal{T}$.

Remark 1: The RIP above implies that $U_{\mathcal{T}}^\top U_{\mathcal{T}}$ has all of its eigen-values in $[1-\delta_s, 1+\delta_s]$. As a result $\|(U_{\mathcal{T}}^\top U_{\mathcal{T}} - I)\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \delta_s\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$.

Definition 2 (s,s-restricted orthogonality constant) *Let $\theta_{s,s}$ be the smallest constant such that for any two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{T},\mathcal{T}' \subseteq \{1,\ldots,d\}$ with $|\mathcal{T}| \leq s$, $|\mathcal{T}'| \leq s$, $2s \leq d$, and for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{T}|}$, $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{T}'|}$,*

$$|\langle U_{\mathcal{T}}\mathbf{x}, U_{\mathcal{T}'}\mathbf{x}'\rangle| \leq \theta_{s,s}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2\|\mathbf{x}'\|_2$$

Remark 2: The above RIP implies that $\|U_{\mathcal{T}}^\top U_{\mathcal{T}'}\|_2 \leq \theta_{s,s}$. Although the results in the sequel are stated using δ_s and $\theta_{s,s}$, we can easily obtained the results with only restricted isometry constants by noting that $\theta_{s,s} \leq \delta_{2s}$ (Candès and Tao, 2005).

The above two constants are standard tools in the analysis of compressive sensing. It has been shown that several random measurement matrices including sub-gaussian measurement matrix, Fourier measurement matrix and incoherent measurement matrix satisfy the above RIP with small δ_s and $\theta_{s,s}$ (Candès et al., 2006).

3.2. Algorithm and Main Results

To motivate our approach, we first consider the following optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \quad \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2. \tag{13}$$

Evidently, the optimal solution to (13) is $\mathbf{x}_*$. We now consider a gradient descent method for optimizing the problem in (13), leading to the following updating equation for $\mathbf{x}_t$

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{x}_t - \nabla\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_t))\right\|_2^2, \tag{14}$$

Algorithm 1 Homotopy Proximal Mapping (HPM) for Compressive Sensing

1: **Input:** The measurement matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$, observations $\mathbf{y} = U\mathbf{x}_* + \mathbf{e}$, a sequence of regularization parameters $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_T$
2: **Initialize** $\mathbf{x}_1 = 0$.
3: **for** $t = 1, \ldots, T$ **do**
4: Compute $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t = \mathbf{x}_t - U^\top(U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y})$
5: Update the solution $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = sign(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t)\left[|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t| - \lambda_t\right]_+$
6: **end for**
7: **Output** the final solution $\mathbf{x}_{T+1}$

where $\nabla\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_t) = \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*$. Since the problem in (13) is both smooth and strongly convex, the above updating enjoys a linear convergence rate with in fact only one step, allowing an efficient reconstruction of $\mathbf{x}_*$.

However, the updating rule in (14) can not be used because it requires knowing $\mathbf{x}_*$, the full information of the sparse signal to be recovered. In compressive sensing, the only available information about the target signal $\mathbf{x}_*$ is through a set of $n < d$ observations given in (12). Using the observations, we construct an approximate gradient as

$$\widehat{\nabla}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_t) = U^\top(U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) = U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*) - U^\top\mathbf{e} \tag{15}$$

As can be seen if $U^TU(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*)$ is close to $\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*$ and $U^\top\mathbf{e}$ is not significantly large in magnitude, $\widehat{\nabla}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_t)$ would provide an useful estimate of $\nabla\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_t)$. To ensure this, we should assume certain restricted conditions on U and a small noise $\mathbf{e}$.

Next, we will use $\widehat{\nabla}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_t)$ as an approximation of $\nabla\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_t)$ and update the solution by performing the following proximal mapping:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_t\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 + \langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t, \widehat{\nabla}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_t)\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \tag{16}$$

where $\lambda_t > 0$ is a ℓ_1 norm regularization parameter that decreases over iterations. The updating rule given in (16) differs from (14) in that (i) the true gradient $\nabla\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_t)$ is replaced with an approximate gradient $\widehat{\nabla}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_t)$ and (ii) an ℓ_1 regularization term $\lambda_t\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$ is added. With appropriate choice of λ_t, this regularization term will essentially remove the noise arising from the approximate gradient and consequentially lead to a global linear convergence rate.

To give the solution of $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ in a closed form, we write (16) as

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\mathbf{x} - \left(\mathbf{x}_t - U^\top(U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y})\right)\right\|_2^2 + \lambda_t\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \tag{17}$$

It is commonly known that the value of $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ is given by (Beck and Teboulle, 2009)

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = sign(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t)\left[|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t| - \lambda_t\right]_+ \tag{18}$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t$ denotes the intermediate solution before soft-thresholding given by

$$\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t = \mathbf{x}_t - U^\top(U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) \tag{19}$$

and $[v]_+ = \max(0, v)$. We present the detailed steps of the proposed algorithm in Algorithm 1 for reconstructing the sparse signal given a set of noiseless/noisy observations. To end this section, we present our main result in the following two theorems regarding the sparse signal recovery with noiseless observations and with noisy observations.

Theorem 1 *Let $\mathbf{x}_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a s-sparse signal and $\mathbf{y} = U\mathbf{x}_*$ be a set of n measurements of $\mathbf{x}_*$. Assume U satisfies RIP such that*

$$\gamma = \delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s} + \delta_{3s} < 1.$$

Let $\{\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_t\}$ be a sequence such that $\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \Delta_1$, and

$$\Delta_{t+1} = (\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s} + \delta_{3s})\Delta_t.$$

If we run Algorithm 1 with $\lambda_t = \dfrac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\Delta_t$, then for all $t \geq 0$

- *$|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ and,*
- *$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \gamma^t \Delta_1$.*

Remark 3: Similar to iterative hard-thresholding algorithms (Garg and Khandekar, 2009; Blumensath and Davies 2009), Algorithm 1 also requires knowledge of sparsity s and RIP constants.

Theorem 2 *Let $\mathbf{x}_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a s-sparse signal and $\mathbf{y} = U\mathbf{x}_* + \mathbf{e}$ be a set of n noisy measurements of $\mathbf{x}_*$. Assume U satisfies RIP such that*

$$\gamma = \delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s} + \delta_{3s} < 1.$$

Let $\{\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_t\}$ be a sequence such that $\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \Delta_1$, and

$$\Delta_{t+1} = \gamma\Delta_t + (1 + \sqrt{2})\sqrt{s}\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty, \quad t \geq 1.$$

If we run Algorithm 1 with

$$\lambda_t = \frac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\Delta_t + \|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty,$$

then for all $t \geq 0$

- *$|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ and,*
- *$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \gamma^t \Delta_1 + \dfrac{1 - \gamma^t}{1 - \gamma}(1 + \sqrt{2})\sqrt{s}\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$.*

Remark 4: Similar to solving Dantzig selector (2) and the ℓ_1 regularized problem (3) for sparse signal recovery that requires $\lambda \geq c\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$, the regularization parameters in our algorithm are also larger than $\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$ and eventually $\lambda_t \geq c\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$, where c depends RIP constants.

Remark 5: While Theorems 1 and 2 are theoretically interesting, the value of λ_t depends on the RIP constants. In Section 4, we present more practical algorithms for (nearly) sparse signal recovery with a sub-gaussian measurement matrix.

3.3. Proof of Theorem 1

We first prove the following proposition regarding the magnitude of elements in $[\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*}$.

Proposition 1 *Let $\mathcal{S}_t$ be the support set of $\mathbf{x}_t$ (the t-th iterate of Algorithm 1) and $\mathcal{S}_*$ be the support set of $\mathbf{x}_*$. Define $\mathcal{S}_t^c = \mathcal{S}_t \cup \mathcal{S}_*$, $\mathcal{S}_t^a = \mathcal{S}_t^c \setminus \mathcal{S}_*$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_t = \mathbf{x}_t - U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*)$. If we assume $|\mathcal{S}_t \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$, then there are at most s entries of $[\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_t]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*}$ with magnitude larger than $\dfrac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$.*

Proof For any subset $\mathcal{S}' \subset \overline{\mathcal{S}}_*$ of size s, let $\mathcal{S}_1' = \mathcal{S}' \cap \mathcal{S}_t^a$ and $\mathcal{S}_2' = \mathcal{S}' \setminus \mathcal{S}_t^a$. First, we have

$$\|[\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_t]_{\mathcal{S}'}\|_2 = \left\|[U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*)]_{\mathcal{S}'} - [\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}'}\right\|_2 = \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_*}\left[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\right]_{\mathcal{S}_*} + U_{\mathcal{S}'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\left[\mathbf{x}_t\right]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a} - [\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}'}\right\|_2$$

where the second equality is due to that the support of $\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*$ is $\mathcal{S}_t^c$ and we split that into two subsets $\mathcal{S}_t^a$ and $\mathcal{S}_*$ that do not intersect with each other. By noting that $\mathcal{S}'$ can be split into two subsets $\mathcal{S}_1'$ and $\mathcal{S}_2'$ that do not intersect with each other and that $\|[\mathbf{v}]_{\mathcal{S}'}\|_2 \leq \|[\mathbf{v}]_{\mathcal{S}_1'}\|_2 + \|[\mathbf{v}]_{\mathcal{S}_2'}\|_2$ with $\mathbf{v} = U^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}[\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a} - \mathbf{x}_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|U_{\mathcal{S}'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_*}\left[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\right]_{\mathcal{S}_*} + U_{\mathcal{S}'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\left[\mathbf{x}_t\right]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a} - [\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}'}\right\|_2 \\
&\leq \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_*}\left[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\right]_{\mathcal{S}_*}\right\|_2 + \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\left[\mathbf{x}_t\right]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a} - [\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}'}\right\|_2 \\
&\leq \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_*}\left[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\right]_{\mathcal{S}_*}\right\|_2 + \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}_2'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\left[\mathbf{x}_t\right]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a} - [\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}_2'}\right\|_2 + \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}_1'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\left[\mathbf{x}_t\right]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a} - [\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}_1'}\right\|_2 \\
&= \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_*}\left[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\right]_{\mathcal{S}_*}\right\|_2 + \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}_2'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\left[\mathbf{x}_t\right]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\right\|_2 + \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}_1'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\left[\mathbf{x}_t\right]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a} - [\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}_1'}\right\|_2 \\
&\leq \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_*}\right\|_2 \left\|[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*]_{\mathcal{S}_*}\right\|_2 + \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}_2'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\right\|_2 \left\|[\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\right\|_2 + \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\left[\mathbf{x}_t\right]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a} - [\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\right\|_2 \\
&= \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_*}\right\|_2 \left\|[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*]_{\mathcal{S}_*}\right\|_2 + \left\|U_{\mathcal{S}_2'}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\right\|_2 \left\|[\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\right\|_2 + \left\|(U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}^\top U_{\mathcal{S}_t^a} - I)\left[\mathbf{x}_t\right]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\right\|_2 \\
&\leq \theta_{s,s}\|[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*]_{\mathcal{S}_*}\|_2 + \theta_{s,s}\|[\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\|_2 + \delta_s\|[\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\|_2 \\
&= \theta_{s,s}\|[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*]_{\mathcal{S}_*}\|_2 + \theta_{s,s}\|[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\|_2 + \delta_s\|[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\|_2 \\
&\leq (\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s})\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality uses the fact that $[\mathbf{x}_t]_{\mathcal{S}_2'} = 0$, the third inequality uses the fact $\mathcal{S}_1' \subseteq \mathcal{S}_t^a$, the fourth inequality uses the RIP conditions (see Remark 1 and Remark 2) by noting that $|\mathcal{S}_t^a| \leq s$, $|\mathcal{S}_2'| \leq s$, $|\mathcal{S}'| \leq s$ and $|\mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$, and the last inequality uses the fact $a + b \leq \sqrt{2(a^2 + b^2)}$ for $a = \|[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*]_{\mathcal{S}_*}\|_2$ and $b = \|[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*]_{\mathcal{S}_t^a}\|_2$. Combining the above inequalities we have

$$\|[\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_t]_{\mathcal{S}'}\|_2 \leq (\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s})\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \tag{20}$$

Since the above inequality holds for any subset $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{S}}_*$ of size s, we form a particular set $\mathcal{S}'$ by including the largest s entries in absolute value of $[\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_t]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*}$. Then the smallest absolute value in $[\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_t]_{\mathcal{S}'}$ is less than $\dfrac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$. If not, then $\|[\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_t]_{\mathcal{S}'}\|_2 \geq \sqrt{s}\frac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 = (\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s})\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$, which contradicts to the result in (20). By the construction of $\mathcal{S}'$, the smallest entry (in magnitude) in $\mathcal{S}'$ is the sth largest entry (in magnitude) in $[\mathbf{x}_t - U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*)]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*}$, we conclude that at most s entries in $[\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_t]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*} = [\mathbf{x}_t - U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*)]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*}$ are larger than $\dfrac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$ in

magnitude. ■

As an immediate result of Proposition 1, we prove the following Corollary.

Corollary 3 *Assume the noiseless setting* $\mathbf{e} = 0$. *Let* $\mathcal{S}_t$ *be the support set of* $\mathbf{x}_t$ *and* $\mathcal{S}_*$ *be the support set of* $\mathbf{x}_*$. *If* $|\mathcal{S}_t \setminus S_*| \leq s$ *and* $\lambda_t \geq \frac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}} \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$, *then* $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ *and* $|\mathcal{S}_* \cup \mathcal{S}_t \cup \mathcal{S}_{t+1}| \leq 3s$.

Proof Note that in the noiseless setting when $\mathbf{e} = 0$, the intermediate solution $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t$ defined in (19) is equal to

$$\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t = \mathbf{x}_t - U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}_t - U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*) \tag{21}$$

As shown in (18), $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = sign(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t) \left[\left| \mathbf{x}_t - U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*) \right| - \lambda_t \right]_+$$

By Proposition 1, we know that there are at most s entries in $\left| \left[\mathbf{x}_t - U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*) \right]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*} \right|$ whose absolute values are larger than $(\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s})\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2/\sqrt{s}$, therefore $[\mathbf{x}_{t+1}]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*}$ has at most s non-zero entries by setting the value of $\lambda_t \geq \frac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}} \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$. It concludes that $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ and $|\mathcal{S}_* \cup \mathcal{S}_t \cup \mathcal{S}_{t+1}| \leq 3s$. ■

Proposition 2 *Assume the noiseless setting* $\mathbf{e} = 0$. *Let* $\mathcal{S}_t$ *be the support set of* $\mathbf{x}_t$ *and* $\mathcal{S}_*$ *be the support set of* $\mathbf{x}_*$. *If* $|\mathcal{S}_t \setminus S_*| \leq s$, $\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \Delta_t$, *and* $\lambda_t = \dfrac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}} \Delta_t$, *Then we have*

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq (\delta_s + \theta_{s,s} + \delta_{3s})\Delta_t$$

To prove above proposition, we need the following Lemma, whose proof is deferred to the appendix.

Lemma 3 *Let* $\mathbf{x}$ *by any* s*-sparse vector and* $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ *given in (17), we have*

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq \lambda_t \sqrt{s} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 + |(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x})^\top (U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}))|$$

Proof [of Proposition 2] Let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{S}_* \cup \mathcal{S}_t \cup \mathcal{S}_{t+1}$, by Corollary 3, we have $|\mathcal{T}| \leq 3s$. Indicated by the RIP condition, $\|U_\mathcal{T}^\top U_\mathcal{T} - I\|_2 \leq \delta_{3s}$. First, since $\mathbf{y} = U\mathbf{x}_*$ we have

$$(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*)^\top \left(U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*) \right) = (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*)^\top (U^\top U - I)(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*)$$

Due to RIP of U and $|\mathcal{S}_* \cup \mathcal{S}_t \cup \mathcal{S}_{t+1}| \leq 3s$, we have

$$|(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*)^\top (U^\top U - I)(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*)| \leq \delta_{3s} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$$

Thus by applying Lemma 3 with $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_*$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2 \leq \lambda_t \sqrt{s} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 + \delta_{3s} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$$

Then we get

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \lambda_t \sqrt{s} + \delta_{3s} \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$$

Assuming $\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \Delta_t$ and plugging the value of λ_t, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq (\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s} + \delta_{3s})\Delta_t$$

■

Proof [Proof of Theorem 1] We aim to prove $\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \gamma^t \Delta_1$ and $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ by induction. This is true when $t = 0$ due to the initialization and the assumption $\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \Delta_1$. Next, assume we have $\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \gamma^{t-1}\Delta_1$ and $|\mathcal{S}_t \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ for any $t \geq 1$. We prove that it also holds for $t+1$. By the definition of Δ_t, we have $\Delta_t = \gamma^{t-1}\Delta_1$. Thus $\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \Delta_t$. By the value of λ_t, we have $\lambda_t = \frac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\Delta_t \geq \frac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$. Hence, the condition in Corollary 3 hold, and as a result $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$. From Proposition 2, we also have $\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq (\delta_s + \theta_{s,s} + \delta_{3s})\Delta_t = \gamma\Delta_t = \gamma^t\Delta_1$. ■

3.4. Proof of Theorem 2

The logic for proving Theorem 2 is similar to proving Theorem 1.

Corollary 4 *Let S_t be the support set of $\mathbf{x}_t$ and $\mathcal{S}_*$ be the support set of $\mathbf{x}_*$. If $|\mathcal{S}_t \setminus S_*| \leq s$ and $\lambda_t \geq \|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty + \frac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$, then $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ and $|\mathcal{S}_* \cup \mathcal{S}_t \cup \mathcal{S}_{t+1}| \leq 3s$.*

Proof The $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = sign(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t) \left[\left| \mathbf{x}_t - U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) \right| - \lambda_t \right]_+$$

Due to $\mathbf{y} = U\mathbf{x}_* + \mathbf{e}$, we have

$$\mathbf{x}_t - U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}_t - U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*) + U^\top \mathbf{e}$$

By Proposition 1, we know that there are at most s entries in $\left[\mathbf{x}_t - U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*)\right]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*}$ with magnitude larger than $\frac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$. As a result, $[\mathbf{x}_t - U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y})]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*}$ has at most s entries whose magnitudes larger than $\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty + \frac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$. Therefore, given the assumed value of λ_t, $[\mathbf{x}_{t+1}]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*}$ has at most s entries larger than zero. It concludes that $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ and $|\mathcal{S}_* \cup \mathcal{S}_t \cup \mathcal{S}_{t+1}| \leq 3s$. ■

Proposition 3 *Let S_t be the support set of $\mathbf{x}_t$ and $\mathcal{S}_*$ be the support set of $\mathbf{x}_*$. If $|\mathcal{S}_t \setminus S_*| \leq s$, $\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \Delta_t$ and $\lambda_t = \|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty + \frac{\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s}}{\sqrt{s}}\Delta_t$, then we have*

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq (\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s} + \delta_{3s})\Delta_t + (1 + \sqrt{2})\sqrt{s}\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$$

Proof Since $\mathbf{y} = U\mathbf{x}_* + \mathbf{e}$, we have

$$(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*)^\top U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*) = (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*)^\top (U^\top U - I)(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*) - (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*)^\top U^\top \mathbf{e}$$

Due to the restricted isometry property, we have

$$|(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*)^\top (U^\top U - I)(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*)| \leq \delta_{3s} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$$

and by Cauchy-Shwartz inequality, we have

$$|(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*)^\top U^\top \mathbf{e}| \leq \sqrt{2s} \|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$$

where we use the fact $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ due to Corollary 4. Thus by combining the two inequalities with Lemma 3 with $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_*$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2 \leq \lambda_t \sqrt{s} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 + \delta_{3s} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 + \sqrt{2s} \|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2$$

Then we get

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \lambda_t \sqrt{s} + \delta_{3s} \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 + \sqrt{2s} \|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$$

Plugging the value of λ_t, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq (\delta_s + \sqrt{2}\theta_{s,s} + \delta_{3s}) \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 + (1 + \sqrt{2}) \sqrt{s} \|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$$

■

Proof [Proof of Theorem 2] First, we assume $\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \Delta_t$, then by Proposition 3, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2 \leq \gamma \Delta_t + (1 + \sqrt{2}) \sqrt{s} \|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty \triangleq \Delta_{t+1}$$

Similarly, we can use Corollary 4 to show that $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ given $|\mathcal{S}_t \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$. Since $\mathcal{S}_1 = \emptyset$ and $\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_*\| \leq \Delta_1$, therefore by induction we can complete the proof.

■

4. Nearly-Sparse Signal Recovery

In this section, we present algorithms and analysis for finding a sparse solution that approximates a nearly-sparse signal $\mathbf{x}_*$ with a small error.

4.1. Algorithms and Main Results

In order to derive a practical algorithm and a better recovery result, we instead assume that the random measurement matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ contains sub-gaussian measurements, i.e., each element U_{ij} is a sub-gaussian random variable and has mean zero and variance $1/n$. The details of the algorithm is presented in Algorithm 2. The value of Δ_1 and Λ can be set according to our analysis. In the sequel, we abuse the notation $\mathcal{S}_*$ to denote the support set of $\mathbf{x}_*^s$. We first state the main theorem regarding the nearly-sparse signal recovery of Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Homotopy Proximal Mapping for learning a Sparse Solution (HPM1)

Input: initial size $\Delta_1 \geq \max(\|\mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2, \Lambda)$, the target sparsity s, a random measurement matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times n}$ and measurements $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\eta < \sqrt{2}-1$

1: Initialize $\mathbf{x}_1 = 0$, $\gamma = (1+\sqrt{2})\eta$
2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \ldots, T$ **do**
3: $\quad \lambda_t = (\Lambda + \eta\Delta_t)/\sqrt{s}$
4: $\quad \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_t - U^\top(U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y})$
5: $\quad \mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathrm{sign}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1})\,[\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1} - \lambda_t]_+$
6: $\quad \Delta_{t+1} = \gamma\Delta_t + (1+\sqrt{2})\Lambda$
7: **end for**

Return $\mathbf{x}_{T+1}$

Theorem 5 *Let $\gamma = (1+\sqrt{2})\eta < 1$. For any $\tau > 0$, assume*

$$\Lambda \triangleq \sqrt{s}\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty + cD(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_*^s), \quad n \geq \frac{c^2(\tau + s\log[d/s])}{\eta^2}.$$

where

$$D(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_*^s) = \|(\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s)^s\|_2 + \sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\ln[d/s]}{n}}\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$$

where c is some universal constant. Let $\{\Delta_t, t = 1, \ldots, T\}$ be a sequence such that $\Delta_1 \geq \max(\|\mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2, \Lambda)$, and

$$\Delta_{t+1} = \gamma\Delta_t + (1+\sqrt{2})\Lambda.$$

With a probability $1 - 2te^{-\tau}$, we have for all $t \geq 0$

$$|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s, \quad \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \Delta_{t+1}$$

In particular, let T_0 be the smallest value such that

$$\gamma^{T_0}\Delta_1 \leq \frac{\Lambda}{1-\gamma}$$

We run Algorithm 2 with T_0 iterations and denote by $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ the output solution. With a probability $1 - 2T_0e^{-\tau}$, we have

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}(1+\sqrt{2})}{1-\gamma}\Lambda. \tag{22}$$

Remark 6: we note that the final solution returned by Algorithm 2 is at most $2s$-sparse. We can also take the s-largest element in $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ to form a s-sparse approximation. The Proposition 5 in the appendix guarantees that the error $\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^s - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$ is only amplified by a constant factor of $\sqrt{3}$.

Remark 7: It can be seen that when $\mathbf{x}_* = \mathbf{x}_*^s$, i.e., the signal is sparse, the problem boils down to sparse signal recovery with noisy observations and the result in Theorem 5 is similar to Theorem 2 except that the RIP constants are replaced with a quantity dependent on n since we directly bound RIP constants of a sub-gaussian matrix. Further, when $\mathbf{e} = 0$, then we can set

Algorithm 3 Homotopy Proximal Mapping for recovering a sparse solution (HPM2)

Input: the target sparsity s, a random measurement matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times n}$ and measurements $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and η, and the total number of iterations T.

Initialize $\mathbf{x}_1 = 0$, $\gamma = 2(1+\sqrt{2})\eta$, and $\lambda_1 = 2\eta\Delta_1/\sqrt{s}$
for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, T$ **do**
  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_t - U^\top(U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y})$
  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \text{sign}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1})\,[\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1} - \lambda_t]_+$
  $\lambda_{t+1} = \gamma\lambda_t$
  if $\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|_0 > 2s$ **then**
    Set $\widehat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}_t$
    Break
  end if
end for

Return $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$

$\Lambda = 0$ in Algorithm 2 and the result in Theorem 5 is similar to that in Theorem 1 for sparse signal recovery under noiseless observations.

Remark 8: The result in Theorem 5 also implies that more observations (i.e., larger n) may lead to more accurate recovery and fast convergence. And also we note that the key property of the measurement matrix U is that it satisfies the JL lemma with a high probability. Therefore, any JL transforms can be used, including sparse JL transform based on random hashing (Dasgupta et al., 2010; Kane and Nelson, 2014), which can speed up the computation.

One issue of Algorithm 2 is that it needs to estimate $\|U^\top\mathbf{e}\|_\infty$ and $cD(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_*^s)$ for setting λ_t and for stopping the algorithm, which could be difficult in many circumstances. In addition, an overestimated Λ could increase the number of iterations and the recovery error. To alleviate this issue, below we present a more practical algorithm for nearly sparse signal recovery which could perform better in absence of prior knowledge. The key idea is motivated by Theorem 5. At earlier stage of Algorithm 2, we would expect that $\Lambda \leq O(\Delta_t)$ and therefore we can absorb Λ into Δ_t for setting λ_t. And for stopping the algorithm we note that as long as $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1}| \leq 2s$, we can have the recovery error bounded by Δ_{t+1} (Theorem 8) or $O(\Lambda)$ (Theorem 9), therefore we stop the algorithm when $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1}| > 2s$. The detailed steps of the practical algorithm are presented in Algorithm 3. The recovery error of Algorithm 3 is provided by the following theorem.

Theorem 6 *Let $\Delta_1 \geq \|\mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$ be a constant. Let $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$ be the solution output from Algorithm 3 and T is the maximum number of iteration allowed. Assume*

$$c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log(d/s)}{n}} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{2(1+\sqrt{3})}$$

Then, with a probability at least $1 - 6Te^{-\tau}$, we have

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \max\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\eta}, \gamma^T\Delta_1\right)$$

where $\gamma = 2(1+\sqrt{2})\eta < 1$, $\Lambda = \sqrt{s}\|U^\top\mathbf{e}\|_\infty + cD(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_*^s)$, $D(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_*^s)$ is defined in Theorem 5 and c is some universal constant.

Remark 9: Although in Algorithm 3 we still use an estimate $\Delta_1 \geq \|\mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$ for setting the initial value of λ, in practice we can set it to a sufficiently large value (e.g., $\|U^\top \mathbf{y}\|_\infty$) such that $\mathbf{x}_2 = 0$.

Remark 10: The universal constant c in Theorem 6 should not be treated literally the same as in Theorem 5. In numerical simulations, we observe that Algorithm 3 is more robust to smaller values of η than Algorithm 2.

Remark 11: Theorem 6 reveals a tradeoff in setting the value of η. A smaller value of η will lead to faster convergence but larger recovery error.

4.2. Proof of Theorem 5

We first give the following lemma.

Lemma 4 *Assume $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$ is a sub-gaussian measurement matrix, where each element in U has zero mean and variance $1/n$. If $|\mathcal{S}_t \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$, then with a probability $1 - 2e^{-\tau}$, we have*

$$\left\|(U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s))^s\right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{s}\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty + cD(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_*^s) + c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log[d/s]}{n}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$$

where $D(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_*^s)$ is defined in Theorem 5 and c is some universal constant.

Lemma 4 is proved in the appendix. Following Lemma 4, we prove the following Corollary.

Corollary 7 *Let $\mathcal{S}_t$ and $\mathcal{S}_{t+1}$ be the support sets of $\mathbf{x}_t$ and $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$, respectively. If $|\mathcal{S}_t \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$, then with a probability $1 - 2e^{-\tau}$, we have*

$$|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$$

provided that

$$\lambda_t \geq \|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty + \frac{cD(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_*^s)}{\sqrt{s}} + \frac{c}{\sqrt{s}}\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log[d/s]}{n}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \tag{23}$$

Proof The proof is similar to that of Corollary 4. Recall that $\mathbf{x}^s$ denotes the vector $\mathbf{x}$ with all but the s-largest entries (in magnitude) set to zero, and $\mathcal{S}_*$ denotes the support of the s-largest entries in $\mathbf{x}_*$. From Lemma 4, we can conclude that $[\mathbf{x}_t - U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y})]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*}$ has at most s entries with magnitude larger than the quantity in the R.H.S of (23). This can be verified by contradiction. If there exists $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{S}}_*$ such that $|\mathcal{A}| > s$ and for all $i \in \mathcal{A}$

$$[\mathbf{x}_t - U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y})]_i \geq \|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty + \frac{cD(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_*^s)}{\sqrt{s}} + \frac{c}{\sqrt{s}}\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log[d/s]}{n}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$$

Let $\mathcal{A}_s \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ such that $|\mathcal{A}_s| = s$. Then

$$\|[\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s - U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y})]_{\mathcal{A}_s}\|_2 \geq \sqrt{s}\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty + cD(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_*^s) + c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log[d/s]}{n}}\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$$

where we use the fact $[\mathbf{x}_*^s]_{\mathcal{A}_s} = 0$. However, the above inequality contradicts to Lemma 4. Since $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = sign(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_t)\left[\left|\mathbf{x}_t - U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y})\right| - \lambda_t\right]_+$$

Therefore, given the assumed value of λ_t, $[\mathbf{x}_{t+1}]_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_*}$ has at most s entries larger than zero. It concludes that $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$. ■

Based on the above corollary, we can prove the following proposition that serves the key to prove the main theorem.

Proposition 4 *Assume* $|\mathcal{S}_t \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$, $\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \Delta_t$, *and define*

$$\Lambda \triangleq \sqrt{s}\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty + cD(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_*^s) \tag{24}$$

Let $\lambda_t = \dfrac{\Lambda + \eta\Delta_t}{\sqrt{s}}$. *Then, with a probability* $1 - 2e^{-\tau}$, *we have*

$$|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s, \quad \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \Delta_{t+1} \triangleq (1+\sqrt{2})\eta\Delta_t + (1+\sqrt{2})\Lambda$$

provided

$$c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log[d/s]}{n}} \leq \eta$$

Proof It is easy to verify that the condition for λ_t in Corollary 7 is satisfied. Combining with the fact that $\mathbf{x}_t$ is $2s$-sparse vector, we have $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ due to Corollary 7. Applying Lemma 3 with $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_*^s$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2^2 \leq \lambda_t\sqrt{s}\,\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 + |(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s)^\top (U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s))| \tag{25}$$

According to Lemma 4, with a probability $1 - 2e^{-\tau}$, we have

$$\left\| \left(U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s) \right)^s \right\|_2 \leq \Lambda + \eta\Delta_t. \tag{26}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&|(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s)^\top \left(U \left(U^\top \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y} \right) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s) \right)| \\
&\leq \left| [\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s]_{\mathcal{S}_*}^\top \left[U \left(U^\top \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y} \right) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s) \right]_{\mathcal{S}_*} \right| \\
&+ \left| [\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s]_{\mathcal{S}_{t+1}\setminus\mathcal{S}_*}^\top \left[U \left(U^\top \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y} \right) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s) \right]_{\mathcal{S}_{t+1}\setminus\mathcal{S}_*} \right| \\
&\leq \left(\|[\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s]_{\mathcal{S}_*}\|_2 + \left\|[\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s]_{\mathcal{S}_{t+1}\setminus\mathcal{S}_*}\right\|_2 \right) (\Lambda + \eta\Delta_t) \\
&\leq \sqrt{2}(\Lambda + \eta\Delta_t)\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $|\mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ and $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$ and inequality in (26), and the last inequality uses the fact $a + b \leq \sqrt{2(a^2 + b^2)}$. Combining the above inequality with (25), with a probability $1 - 2e^{-\tau}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2^2 &\leq \left(\lambda_t\sqrt{s} + \sqrt{2}\eta\Delta_t + \sqrt{2}\Lambda \right) \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \\
&\leq [(1+\sqrt{2})\eta\Delta_t + (1+\sqrt{2})\Lambda]\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2,
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq (1+\sqrt{2})\eta\Delta_t + (1+\sqrt{2})\Lambda$$

■

Proof [Proof of Theorem 5] Following Proposition 4 and by induction, we can prove for any t, we have with a probability $1 - 2te^{-\tau}$

$$|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$$
$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \Delta_{t+1}$$

Since $\Delta_{t+1} = \gamma\Delta_t + (1+\sqrt{2})\Lambda$, we have

$$\Delta_{t+1} \leq \gamma^t\Delta_1 + \frac{1-\gamma^t}{1-\gamma}(1+\sqrt{2})\Lambda \leq \gamma^t\Delta_1 + \frac{1}{1-\gamma}(1+\sqrt{2})\Lambda$$

Let $t = T_0$ such that $\gamma^{T_0}\Delta_1 \leq \Lambda/(1-\gamma)$, we then have

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{T_0+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}(1+\sqrt{2})\Lambda}{1-\gamma}$$

with a probability $1 - 2T_0e^{-\tau}$, which completes the proof of Theorem 5. ■

4.3. Proof of Theorem 6

We first state two theorems that are central to our analysis. Theorem 8 reveals that the recovery error of Algorithm 3 will decrease by a constant factor at the beginning, and Theorem 9 shows that the recovery error will keep small in the later stage. We abuse the notation Δ_t.

Theorem 8 *Let $\Delta_1 \geq \|\mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$ be a constant, $\gamma = 2(1+\sqrt{2})\eta$, and $\{\mathbf{x}_t, t = 1, \ldots\}$ be solutions generated by Algorithm 3. Assume $|\mathcal{S}_t \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$, $\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s\| \leq \Delta_t$, and $\Lambda \leq \eta\Delta_t$. Then, with a probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\tau}$, we have*

$$|\mathcal{S}_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s \text{ and } \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \Delta_{t+1} \triangleq \gamma\Delta_t$$

provided the condition in Theorem 6 is true.

Theorem 9 *Let $\{\mathbf{x}_t, t = 1, \ldots\}$ be solutions generated by Algorithm 3. Assume $|\mathcal{S}_t| \leq 2s$, $\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s\| \leq \Lambda/\eta$, and $\Lambda > \eta\Delta_t$. If $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1}| \leq 2s$, then with a probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\tau}$, we have*

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq 2(1+\sqrt{3})\Lambda \leq \Lambda/\eta$$

provided the condition in Theorem 6 is true.

Proof [Proof of Theorem 6] Let

$$k = \min\{t : \Lambda > \eta\Delta_t\}.$$

Assume $k \geq 1$, otherwise Theorem 6 holds with $T = 1$. In the following, we consider two cases $T < k$ and $T \geq k$, where T is the input to the algorithm.

$T < k$. Since the condition $\Lambda \leq \eta\Delta_t$ holds for $t = 1, \ldots, T$, we can apply Theorem 8 to bound the recovery error in each iteration. Thus, with a probability at least $1 - 2Te^{-\tau}$, we have

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 = \|\mathbf{x}_{T+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \Delta_{T+1} = \gamma^T \Delta_1.$$

$T \geq k$. From the above analysis, with a probability at least $1-2(k-1)e^{-\tau}$, we have $\|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \Delta_k$ and $|\mathcal{S}_k \setminus \mathcal{S}_*| \leq s$, which also means our algorithm arrives at the k-th iteration. In the k-th iteration, there will be two cases: $|\mathcal{S}_{k+1}| > 2s$ and $|\mathcal{S}_{k+1}| \leq 2s$. For the first case, our algorithm terminates, and return $\mathbf{x}_k$ as the final solution implying

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 = \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \Delta_k \leq \Lambda/\eta.$$

For the second case, Algorithm 3 keeps running, and we can bound the recovery error by Theorem 9. In particular, if at $T' \geq k$ $|\mathcal{S}_{T'+1}| > 2s$, our algorithm terminates and returns $\mathbf{x}_{T'}$ as the final solution, which implies $|\mathcal{S}_t| < 2s, t \leq T'$. By applying induction of Theorem 9 from $t = k$, we can have

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 = \|\mathbf{x}_{T'} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq 2(1+\sqrt{3})\Lambda \leq \Lambda/\eta.$$

■

Proof [Proof of Theorem 8] The proof is very similar to that of Theorem 4 by noting that $\lambda_t = 2\eta\Delta_t/\sqrt{s} > (\Lambda + \eta\Delta_t)/\sqrt{s}$ satisfies the condition in Corollary 7. ■

Proof [Proof of Theorem 9] First we note that $\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s$ is at most $3s$-sparse (at most $3s$ elements in $\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*$ are non-zeros). With a slight change of the universal constant, we still have Lemma 4 (c.f. the proof of Lemma 4 in the appendix). Then, with a probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\tau}$, we have

$$\left\| \left[U\left(U^\top \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}\right) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s) \right]^s \right\|_2 \leq \Lambda + c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log(d/s)}{m}} \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq \Lambda + \eta\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq 2\Lambda.$$

Notice that $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s$ is $3s$-sparse in this case, and we can verify that

$$\left| (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s)^\top \left(U\left(U^\top \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}\right) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s) \right) \right| \leq 2\sqrt{3}\Lambda \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2.$$

To see this, we can split $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}$ into three components each with at most s non-zero entries and non-overlapping support. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s)^\top \left(U\left(U^\top \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}\right) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s) \right) \right| \\
&\leq (\|\mathbf{a}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{c}\|_2) \left\| \left[U\left(U^\top \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}\right) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s) \right]^s \right\|_2 \\
&\leq (\|\mathbf{a}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{c}\|_2) 2\Lambda \leq 2\sqrt{3}\Lambda \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact $a + b + c \leq \sqrt{3(a^2 + b^2 + c^2)}$. Applying Lemma 3 with $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_*^s$, we have, with a probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\tau}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2^2 &\leq \lambda_t\sqrt{s}\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 + |(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s)^\top (U^\top(U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s))| \\
&\leq \left(\lambda_t\sqrt{s} + 2\sqrt{3}\Lambda\right) \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq 2(1+\sqrt{3})\Lambda \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact $\eta = \frac{2\eta\Delta_t}{\sqrt{s}} \leq \frac{2\Lambda}{\sqrt{t}}$ due to the assumption $\Lambda > \eta\Delta_t$. Thus

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2 \leq 2(1+\sqrt{3})\Lambda.$$

■

5. Numerical Simulations

In this section, we conduct numerical simulations to verify the proposed algorithms and the developed analysis, and also compare with previous algorithms.

Verifying Theorem 5 We first conduct some empirical studies to verify the results in Theorem 5. We generate a measurement matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$ such that each element follows an i.i.d distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/n)$. To generate a s-sparse target signal, we sample the non-zeros elements from standard normal distribution followed by ℓ_2 norm normalization. To generate a nearly sparse target signal, we set the i-th element of $\mathbf{x}_*$ to i^{-1} followed by ℓ_2 norm normalization. The noise vector $\mathbf{e}$ is drawn from uniform distribution $[-\sigma, \sigma]$. We run Algorithm 2 with hundreds of iterations and plot error/sparsity versus the number of iterations in Figure 1, Figure 2 and Figure 3 for $n = 2000, d = 10000, s = 20, \sigma = 0.001$ under three different settings, respectively. The value of Δ_1 is set to $\|\mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$, the value of η is set to $0.4, 0.4, 0.3$ for three different settings, respectively, and the value of Λ is set to $0, \sqrt{s}\|U^\top\mathbf{e}\|_\infty$ and $\sqrt{s}\|U^\top\mathbf{e}\|_\infty + \eta\|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^s\|_2$, respectively. These results clearly validate Theorem 5.

Varying η We conduct more experiments to demonstrate that the robustness of the proposed HPM algorithm (Algorithm 2) with respect to the value of η. The data is generated similarly as before with $n = 1000, d = 10000, s = 20, \sigma = 0.001$. The results are shown in Figure 4, Figure 5 and Figure 6 for different values of η, not exceeding its upper limit $\sqrt{2} - 1 = 0.414$. The smallest value of η in each Figure is the smallest one [2] that guarantees convergence. From these results, we have several interesting observations: (i) from noise to noiseless observations and from sparse signal to nearly sparse signal, the algorithm becomes more robust to smaller values of η and less robust to larger values of η. For example in setting I, the smallest value of η that guarantees convergence is 0.32, but when adding some noise to the observations, the smallest value of η reduces to 0.3. However, the value $\eta = 0.41$ which originally works for noiseless observations will cause the algorithm not to converge in setting II. (ii) As long as convergence is observed, a smaller value of η yields faster convergence in all cases and more accurate recovery in settings II and III. (ii) Even though the sparsity of intermediate solutions exceeds $2s$, the algorithm still converges.

Varying n We also verify that more observations can lead to faster convergence and more accurate recovery. To this end, we generate data similarly as before with different values of $n = 1000, 1500, 2000, 2500$. For each value of n, we choose the smallest η that can guarantee the convergence. The results for the first two settings are shown in Figure 7, which clearly demonstrate that the with more observations, we can use smaller η to get a faster convergence and a more accurate recovery in setting II. Similar result has been observed for setting III.

2. We start a value of $\eta = 0.41$ and decrease by 0.1 until we observe divergence.



(a) error (b) sparsity

Figure 1: Recovery error and sparsity versus iterations in setting I.



(a) error (b) sparsity

Figure 2: Recovery error and sparsity versus iterations in setting II.



(a) error (b) sparsity

Figure 3: Recovery error and sparsity versus iterations in setting III.

HPM1 vs. HPM2 We also compare HPM2 with HPM1 in setting III to demonstrate the benefit of HPM2. The data is generated similarly as before with $n = 1000, d = 10000, s = 20, \sigma = 0.001$. The result is shown in Figure 8(a). The initial value of λ in HPM2 is set to $\|U^\top \mathbf{y}\|_\infty$. It shows that HPM2 with an appropriate value of η can achieve similar convergence speed and even more accurate recovery than HPM1. We also plot the recovery error and sparsity of intermediate solutions for HPM2 in Figure 8(b) and 8(c). The curves exhibit a tradeoff in setting the value of η, namely a smaller value of η leads to a faster convergence but a worse recovery, which is consistent with Theorem 6.



(a) error (b) sparsity

Figure 4: Recovery error and sparsity versus iterations in setting I for different values of η.



(a) error (b) sparsity

Figure 5: Recovery error and sparsity versus iterations in setting II for different values of η.



(a) error (b) sparsity

Figure 6: Recovery error and sparsity versus iterations in setting III for different values of η.

Comparing with Proximal-Gradient Homotopy Method (PGH) We compare HPM2 with the PGH method that solves the BPDN problem for sparse signal recovery (Xiao and Zhang, 2013). The data is generated exactly the same as in (Xiao and Zhang, 2013). In particular, we generate a random measurement matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$ with $n = 1000$ and $d = 5000$. The entries of the matrix U are generated independently with the uniform distribution over the interval $[-1, +1]$ and are scaled to have a variance $1/n$. The vector $\mathbf{x}_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is generated with the same distribution at 100 randomly chosen coordinates (i.e., $\mathcal{S}_* = 100$). The noise $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a dense vector with independent random entries with the uniform distribution over the interval $[-\sigma, \sigma]$, where σ is the noise magnitude and



(a) setting I: different n (b) setting II: different n

Figure 7: Recovery error vs different n. The value of η is chosen as the best one for each value of n.



(a) error (b) error (c) sparsity

Figure 8: (a) HPM1 vs HPM2 with different values of η in setting III. (b,c) recovery error and sparsity of solutions in HPM2 versus iterations in setting III for different values of η.

is set to 0.01. Finally the vector $\mathbf{y}$ was obtained as $\mathbf{y} = U\mathbf{x}_* + \mathbf{e}$. The target value of λ in PGH is chosen to be $\lambda_{\text{target}} = 1$ according to (Xiao and Zhang, 2013). The parameters in PGH (e.g., $\gamma_{inc}, \gamma_{dec}, \eta, \delta$) are exactly the same as those used in (Xiao and Zhang, 2013). The initial value of λ for both PGH and HPM2 is set to $\|U^\top \mathbf{y}\|_\infty$. We plot the recovery error and sparsity of generated solutions versus the number of proximal updates in Figure 9. We can see that HPM2 achieves faster convergence and better recovery than PGH for sparse signal recovery.

Comparing with Iterative Soft Thresholding algorithm (ISTA) and Iterative Hard Thresholding (IHT). Finally, we compare HPM2 with two other algorithms, namely ISTA and IHT (Garg and Khandekar, 2009). The measurement matrix U and the noise vector $\mathbf{e}$ are generated the same as above, i.e., $U \in \mathbb{R}^{1000\times 5000}$ and each entry is sampled from a uniform distribution over $[-1, +1]$ and is scaled to have a variance of $1/n$. For the ground-truth signal $\mathbf{x}_*$, we consider two scenarios: (i) a sparse signal with 100 randomly chosen coordinates sampled from the uniform distribution over $[-1, +1]$; (ii) a nearly sparse signal such that the entries follow an exponential decay, i.e., $[\mathbf{x}_*]_i = e^{-i}$. Since the proposed HPM2 and IHT require a parameter s that estimates the sparsity of the target signal, in the first scenario we vary s among three values $s = 100, s = 200$



Figure 9: HPM2 vs. PGH. Two different values of η are used in HPM2. PGH requires 96 proximal updates and HPM2 requires 51 and 61 proximal updates with $\eta = 0.182$ and $\eta = 0.185$, respectively. The error of the final solution returned by PGH is 0.0365, and the error of the final solution returned by HPM2 with the two different values of η is 0.0317, and 0.0227, respectively. The recovery error of the 100-sparse solution formed by taking the top 100 elements in the returned solution by HPM2 is 0.0312 and 0.0223.

and $s = 400$. In the second scenario, we fix $s = 100$. For other parameters that each algorithm relies on (e.g., η in HPM2, the step size parameter $1/\gamma$ in IHT and the regularization parameter λ in ISTA), we tune them among numerous values and report the performance of the best one. We vary the value of η in $[0.1, 0.2]$, the value of γ in $[1, 10]$ and the value of λ in $[0.001, 1]$. The recovery error measured by the difference between the top s components of the returned solution and the top s components of the ground-truth signal is plotted in Figure 10. From the results, we observe that (i) IHT and HPM2 converge much faster than ISTA; (ii) when the ground-truth signal is sparse and the parameter s is set right to number of non-zeros in the ground-truth signal, IHT performs better than HPM2; (iii) however, when the parameter s is overestimated and the ground-truth signal is not exactly sparse, the proposed algorithm HPM2 performs better than IHT, where the later case is consistent with our comparison in Section II.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented a simple homotopy proximal mapping algorithm for compressive sensing. We proved a global linear convergence for the proposed homotopy proximal mapping algorithm for solving compressive sensing under three different settings. For sparse signal recovery, our results almost recover the best condition on the RIP constants for compressive sensing. For nearly sparse signal recovery, our result is better than previous results for instance-level recovery. In addition, we develop a practical algorithm that can run without any knowledge of noise level. Numerical simulations verify the proposed algorithms and the established theorems.

Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 3

Define $L_t(\mathbf{x})$ as

$$L_t(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\left\|\mathbf{x} - \left(\mathbf{x}_t - U^\top(U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y})\right)\right\|_2^2 + \lambda_t\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$$



(a) $s = 100$ (b) $s = 200$

(c) $s = 400$ (d) $s = 100$

Figure 10: HPM2 vs. IST and IHT. From left to right: (a) $\mathbf{x}_*$ is sparse with only 100 non-zero entries and the parameter s in HPM2 and IHT is set to 100; (b) $\mathbf{x}_*$ is sparse with only 100 non-zero entries and the parameter s in HPM2 and IHT is set to 200; (c) $\mathbf{x}_*$ is sparse with only 100 non-zero entries and the parameter s in HPM2 and IHT is set to 400; (d) $\mathbf{x}_*$ is nearly sparse and the parameter s in HPM2 and IHT is set to 100.

Since $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ is the optimal solution to $\min_{\mathbf{x}} L_t(\mathbf{x})$, therefore, we have for any $\mathbf{x}$

$$(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x})^\top \partial L_t(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq 0$$

i.e., there exists a $g_{t+1} \in \partial \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|_1$

$$(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x})^\top (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t) + (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x})^\top U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) + \lambda_t (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x})^\top g_{t+1} \leq 0$$

Let $\mathbf{x}$ be a s-sparse vector with support set $\mathcal{S}$. Then we have

$$(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x})^\top (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t) + (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x})^\top U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) + \lambda_t \|[\mathbf{x}_{t+1}]_{\mathcal{S}_{t+1}\backslash\mathcal{S}}\|_1 \leq \lambda_t \|[\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}]_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1$$

where we use $([\mathbf{x}_{t+1}]_{\mathcal{S}_{t+1}\backslash\mathcal{S}})^\top g_{t+1} = \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|_1$ and $\|g_{t+1}\|_\infty \leq 1$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x})^\top (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t) + (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x})^\top U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) \\
&= \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + (\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x})^\top \Big(U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}) \Big)
\end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof by noting that $\lambda_t \|[\mathbf{x}_{t+1}]_{\mathcal{S}_{t+1}\backslash\mathcal{S}}\|_1 \geq 0$ and

$$\|[\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}]_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{s} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|_2.$$

Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 4

We first decompose $U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s)$ into 3 components.

$$\begin{aligned}
&U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s) \\
=&U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - U\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{e}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s) \\
=&\underbrace{U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_*^s - \mathbf{x}_*)}_{:=\mathbf{w}_a} + \underbrace{(U^\top U - I)(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s)}_{:=\mathbf{w}_b} - \underbrace{U^\top \mathbf{e}}_{:=\mathbf{w}_c}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\left\| \left[U^\top (U\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s) \right]^s \right\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{w}_a^s\|_2 + \|\mathbf{w}_b^s\|_2 + \|\mathbf{w}_c^s\|_2. \tag{27}$$

The last term can be bounded by $\|\mathbf{w}_c^s\|_2 \leq \sqrt{s}\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$. In the following analysis, we intend to bound $\|(U^\top U\mathbf{z})^s\|_2$ for a fixed vector $\mathbf{z}$, $\left\|((UU^\top - I)\mathbf{z})^s\right\|_2$ for any sparse vector $\mathbf{z}$. We will address these two bounds in the following two subsections.

B.1. Bounding $\|(U^\top U\mathbf{z})^s\|_2$ for a fixed $\mathbf{z}$

First, we define

$$\mathcal{K}_{d,s} = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq 1, \|\mathbf{w}\|_0 \leq s \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z}) = \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}_{d,s}} \mathbf{w}^\top U^\top U\mathbf{z}$$

It is easy to verify that

$$\|(U^\top U\mathbf{z})^s\|_2 = \mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z})$$

Hence, to bound $\|(U^\top U\mathbf{z})^s\|_2$, we need to bound $\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z})$.

Theorem 10 *For a fixed $\mathbf{z}$, with a probability $1 - e^{-\tau}$ for any $\tau > 0$, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z}) \leq c\left(\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log(d/s)}{n}} \|\mathbf{z}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{z}^s\|_2 \right)$$

where c is some universal constant.

Proof [Proof of Theorem 10] Let $\mathcal{K}_{d,s}(\epsilon)$ be the proper ϵ-net for $\mathcal{K}_{d,s}$ with the smallest cardinality (i.e. covering number), and let $N(\mathcal{K}_{d,s}, \epsilon)$ be the covering number for $\mathcal{K}_{d,s}$. The following Lemma bounds the covering number $N(\mathcal{K}_{d,s}, \epsilon)$.

Lemma 5 *(Lemma 3.3 from (Plan and Vershynin, 2011)) For $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $s \leq d$, we have*

$$\log N(\mathcal{K}_{d,s}, \epsilon) \leq s \log\left(\frac{9d}{\epsilon s}\right)$$

Using the ϵ-net $\mathcal{K}_{d,s}(\epsilon)$, we define a discretized version of $\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z})$ as

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z}, \epsilon) = \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}_{d,s}(\epsilon)} \mathbf{w}^\top U^\top U\mathbf{z}$$

The following lemma relates $\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z}, \epsilon)$ with $\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z})$.

Lemma 6 *For $\epsilon \in (0, 1/\sqrt{2})$, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z}) \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z}, \epsilon)}{1 - \sqrt{2}\epsilon}$$

Based on the conclusion from Lemma 6, it is sufficient to bound $\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z}, \epsilon)$. The following lemma follows from the JL lemma for a sub-gassian matrix.

Lemma 7 *For fixed $\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ such that $\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq 1$, with a probability $1 - e^{-\tau}$, we have*

$$\mathbf{w}^\top U^\top U\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq c\sqrt{\frac{\tau}{n}}\|\mathbf{z}\|_2$$

where c is some universal constant.

Continued Proof of Theorem 10. By taking the union bound for $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}_{d,s}(\epsilon)$, we have, with a probability $1 - e^{-\tau}$,

$$\max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}_{d,s}(\epsilon)} \left|\mathbf{w}^\top U^\top U\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{z}\right| \leq c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log(9d/[\epsilon s])}{n}}|\mathbf{z}|_2$$

if $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, and therefore

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z}, \epsilon) \leq c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log(9d/[\epsilon s])}{n}}\|\mathbf{z}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{z}^s\|_2$$

We complete the proof by using Lemma 6 with $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$ and assuming d is sufficiently large. ■

B.2. Bound $\left\|((U^\top U - I)\mathbf{z})^s\right\|_2$ for any sparse $\mathbf{z}$

Theorem 11 *With a probability $1 - e^{-\tau}$, for any $\mathbf{z}$ with $\|\mathbf{z}\|_0 \leq s$, we have*

$$\left\|((U^\top U - I)\mathbf{z})^s\right\|_2 \leq c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log[d/s]}{n}}\|\mathbf{z}\|_2$$

where c is some universal constant.

Proof [Proof of Theorem 11] We define $\Sigma_s(\mathbf{z})$ as

$$\Sigma_s(\mathbf{z}) = \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}_{d,s}} \mathbf{w}^\top (U^\top U - I)\mathbf{z}$$

It is easy to see $\left\|((U^\top U - I)\mathbf{z})^s\right\|_2 = \Sigma_s(\mathbf{z})$. Following the analysis of Theorem 10, it is easy to verify that, with a probability $1 - e^{-\tau}$, for a fixed $\mathbf{z}$, we have

$$\Sigma_s(\mathbf{z}) \leq c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log[d/s]}{n}}\|\mathbf{z}\|_2$$

for some universal constant c. To extend this result to any s-sparse $\mathbf{z}$, we define

$$\mu_s = \max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{K}_{d,s}} \Sigma_s(\mathbf{z})$$

Evidently, for any $\mathbf{z}$ with $\|\mathbf{z}\|_0 \leq s$, we have

$$\Sigma_s(\mathbf{z}) \leq \mu_s \|\mathbf{z}\|_2$$

Using the same idea as Theorem 10, we define a discrete version of μ_s as

$$\mu_s(\epsilon) = \max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{K}_{d,s}(\epsilon)} \Sigma_s(\mathbf{z})$$

and following the same argument as Lemma 6, we have

$$\mu_s \leq \frac{\mu_s(\epsilon)}{1 - \sqrt{2}\epsilon}$$

Since for any fixed $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{K}_{d,s}$, with a probability $1 - e^{-\tau}$, we have

$$\Sigma_s(\mathbf{z}) \leq c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log[d/s]}{n}}$$

By taking the union bound and using the relationship between μ_s and $\mu_s(\epsilon)$, with a probability $1 - e^{-\tau}$, we have

$$\mu_s \leq c\sqrt{\frac{\tau + s\log[d/s]}{n}}$$

We complete the proof by using $\Sigma_s(\mathbf{z}) \leq \mu_s \|\mathbf{z}\|_2$. ■

Proof [Proof of Lemma 4] Combining the above results, we can complete the proof of Lemma 4. In particular, we apply Theorem 10 to bound $\|\mathbf{w}_a^s\|_2 = \|(U^\top U(\mathbf{x}_*^s - \mathbf{x}_*))^s\|_2$ in (27), and apply Theorem 11 to bound $\|\mathbf{w}_b^s\|_2 = \|(U^\top U - I)(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s)\|_2$ for any $2s$-sparse $\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_*^s$. ■

Appendix C. Other Lemmas and Proofs

C.1. Proof of Lemma 6

The analysis is the same as that for Lemma 9.2 of (Koltchinskii, 2011), we include it for completeness. For any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{K}_{d,s}$, we can always find two vectors $\mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{y}'$ such that

$$\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}', \ \|\mathbf{y}\|_0 \leq s, \ \|\mathbf{y}'\|_0 \leq s, \ \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{y}' = 0.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}', UU^\top \mathbf{z} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{y}, UU^\top \mathbf{z} \rangle + \langle -\mathbf{y}', UU^\top \mathbf{z} \rangle \\
=&\|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{y}}{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}, UU^\top \mathbf{z} \right\rangle + \|\mathbf{y}'\|_2 \left\langle \frac{-\mathbf{y}'}{\|\mathbf{y}'\|_2}, UU^\top \mathbf{z} \right\rangle \\
\leq&(\|\mathbf{y}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{y}'\|_2)\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z}) \leq \mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z})\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{y}'\|_2^2} \\
=&\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z})\sqrt{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'\|_2 = \mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z})\sqrt{2}\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z}) =& \max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{K}_{d,s}} \mathbf{w}^\top UU^\top \mathbf{z} \\ \leq& \mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z},\epsilon) + \sup_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{K}_{d,s},\mathbf{x}'\in\mathcal{K}_{d,s}(\epsilon),\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'\|_2\leq\epsilon} \langle \mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}', UU^\top\mathbf{z}\rangle \\ \leq& \mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z},\epsilon) + \sqrt{2}\epsilon\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z})\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z}) \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{z},\epsilon)}{1-\sqrt{2}\epsilon}.$$

C.2. Proof of Lemma 7

Let us first assume $\|\mathbf{z}\|_2 = 1$, otherwise

$$\mathbf{w}^\top U^\top U\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{w}^\top\mathbf{z} \leq (\mathbf{w}^\top U^\top U\mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{w}^\top\mathbf{z}')\|\mathbf{z}\|_2$$

where $\mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{z}/\|\mathbf{z}\|_2$. Following JL lemma for a sub-gaussian matrix (Nelson, 2013), we know that with a probability $1-\exp(-c\epsilon^2 n)$, where c is some constant,

$$(1-\epsilon)\|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2 \leq \|U\mathbf{z}\|_2^2 \leq (1+\epsilon)\|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{w}^\top U^\top U\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{w}^\top\mathbf{z} =& \frac{\|U(\mathbf{w}+\mathbf{z})\|_2^2 - \|U(\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{z})\|_2^2}{4} - \mathbf{w}^\top\mathbf{z} \\ \leq& \frac{\epsilon}{2}(\|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2) \leq \epsilon\end{aligned}$$

Therefore with a probability $1-e^{-\tau}$, we have

$$\mathbf{w}^\top U^\top U\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{w}^\top\mathbf{z} \leq c\sqrt{\frac{\tau}{n}}\|\mathbf{z}\|_2$$

Appendix D. Top-s recovery error

Proposition 5 *Let $\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{R}^{2s}$ be an arbitrary s-sparse vector. Then we have*

$$\|\mathbf{x}^s - \mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{3}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|_2, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{2s}$$

Proof Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be the support set of $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$, respectively. If $|\mathcal{X}| \leq s$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}^s - \mathbf{y}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|_2.$$

Thus, in the following, we only need to consider the case $|\mathcal{X}| > s$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the indices of the s largest elements in $\mathbf{x}$, and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{X}\setminus\mathcal{A}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|_2^2 =& \sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{Y}} x_i^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{Y}} (x_i-y_i)^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{B}\cap\mathcal{Y}} (x_i-y_i)^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{B}\setminus\mathcal{Y}} x_i^2, \\ \|\mathbf{x}^s-\mathbf{y}\|_2^2 =& \sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{Y}} x_i^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{Y}} (x_i-y_i)^2 + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{B}\cap\mathcal{Y}} y_i^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{Y}| = |\mathcal{A}| = s \geq |\mathcal{Y}| = |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{Y}|$$

we have $|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{Y}| \geq |\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{Y}|$. As a result, we must have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{Y}} x_i^2 \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{Y}} x_i^2. \tag{28}$$

Since

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{Y}} y_i^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{Y}} (x_i - y_i)^2 + 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{Y}} x_i^2 \overset{(28)}{\leq} 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{Y}} (x_i - y_i)^2 + 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{Y}} x_i^2,$$

we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}^s - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 \leq 3 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{Y}} x_i^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{Y}} (x_i - y_i)^2 + 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{Y}} (x_i - y_i)^2 \leq 3 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2.$$

■

Appendix E. Upper bound of $\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty$

Proposition 6 *Let $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ be a random matrix with subGaussian entries of mean 0 and variance $1/n$. Then with a probability $1 - 2e^{-\tau}$, we have*

$$\|U^\top \mathbf{e}\|_\infty \leq \theta \|\mathbf{e}\|_2 \sqrt{\frac{\tau + \log d}{n}} \tag{29}$$

where $\theta > 0$ is a constant.

Proof Let $\mathbf{u}_i$ denote the i-th column vector of U. Since $[\mathbf{u}_i]_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$ are independent $(1/\sqrt{n})$ sub-gaussian variables, therefore $\mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{e}$ is $(\|\mathbf{e}\|_2/\sqrt{n})$ sub-gaussian variable. According to the property of a sub-gaussian vector, there exists $\theta > 0$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{u}_i^\top \mathbf{e}\|_{\psi_2} \leq \theta \frac{\|\mathbf{e}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}, i = 1, \ldots, d$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_2}$ is called an Orlicz norm (Rao and Ren, 1991). Using the following property of Orliz norm (Koltchinskii, 2011), with a probability $1 - 2e^{-\tau}$, we have

$$|\mathbf{u}_i^\top \mathbf{e}| \leq \|\mathbf{u}_i^\top \mathbf{e}\|_{\psi_2} \sqrt{\tau} = \theta \|\mathbf{e}\|_2 \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{n}}$$

Taking the union bound, we can complete the proof. ■

References

Alekh Agarwal, Sahand Negahban, and Martin J. Wainwright. Fast global convergence rates of gradient methods for high-dimensional statistical recovery. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 23*, pages 37–45, 2010.

Amir Beck and Marc Teboulle. A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems. *SIAM J. Img. Sci.*, 2(1):183–202, March 2009. ISSN 1936-4954.

Stephen Becker, Jérôme Bobin, and Emmanuel J. Candès. Nesta: A fast and accurate first-order method for sparse recovery. *SIAM J. Img. Sci.*, 4:1–39, 2011. ISSN 1936-4954.

Peter J. Bickel, Ya'acov Ritov, and Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Simultaneous analysis of lasso and dantzig selector. *Annals of Statistics*, 37(4), 2009.

Thomas Blumensath and Mike E. Davies. Iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing. *Appl. Comp. Harm. Anal*, pages 265–274, 2009.

Kristian Bredies and Dirk A Lorenz. Linear convergence of iterative soft-thresholding. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 14(5-6):813–837, 2008.

T. Tony Cai and Anru Zhang. Sparse representation of a polytope and recovery of sparse signals and low-rank matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(1):122–132, 2014.

E. Candès. The restricted isometry property and its implications for compressed sensing. *C. R. Acad. des Sci Serie I*, pages 589–592, 2008.

E. Candès and T. Tao. The dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n. *Ann. Statist.*, 35(6):2313–2351, 2007.

E. J. Candès and T. Tao. Decoding by linear programming. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor.*, 51:4203–4215, 2005.

E. J. Candès and M. B. Wakin. An introduction to compressive sampling. *Signal Processing Magazine, IEEE*, 25:21–30, 2008.

Emmanuel J. Candès, Justin K. Romberg, and Terence Tao. Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 59:1207–1223, 2006. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cpa.20124.

Scott Shaobing Chen, David L. Donoho, and Michael A. Saunders. Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 20(1):33–61, 1998.

Scott Shaobing Chen, David L. Donoho, and Michael A. Saunders. Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit. *SIAM Rev.*, 43:129–159, 2001.

Anirban Dasgupta, Ravi Kumar, and Tamás Sarlós. A sparse johnson–lindenstrauss transform. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, STOC '10, pages 341–350, 2010.

G. Davis, S. Mallat, and M. Avellaneda. Adaptive greedy approximations. *Constructive approximation*, 13:57–98, 2004.

D. L. Donoho, Y. Tsaig, I. Drori, and J. L. Starck. Sparse solution of underdetermined systems of linear equations by stagewise orthogonal matching pursuit. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor.*, 58: 1094–1121, 2012. ISSN 0018-9448.

David L. Donoho. Compressed sensing. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 52:1289–1306, 2006.

David L. Donoho and Yaakov Tsaig. Fast solution of l1-norm minimization problems when the solution may be sparse. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54:4789–4812, 2008.

Bradley Efron, Trevor Hastie, Iain Johnstone, and Robert Tibshirani. Least angle regression. *Annals of Statistics*, 32:407–499, 2004.

Y.C. Eldar and G. Kutyniok. *Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications*. Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2012. ISBN 9781107005587.

Simon Foucart. Hard thresholding pursuit: An algorithm for compressive sensing. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 49(6):2543–2563, 2011.

Rahul Garg and Rohit Khandekar. Gradient descent with sparsification: An iterative algorithm for sparse recovery with restricted isometry property. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 337–344. ACM, 2009.

E. T. Hale, Y. Wotao, and Y. Zhang. Fixed-point continuation for l1-minimization: methodology and convergence. *SIAM J. on Optimization*, 19(3):1107–1130, 2008.

William Johnson and Joram Lindenstrauss. Extensions of Lipschitz mappings into a Hilbert space. In *Conference in modern analysis and probability (New Haven, Conn., 1982)*, volume 26, pages 189–206. 1984.

Daniel M. Kane and Jelani Nelson. Sparser johnson-lindenstrauss transforms. *Journal of the ACM*, 61:4:1–4:23, 2014.

S.J. Kim, K. Koh, M. Lustig, S. Boyd, and D. Gorinevsky. An Interior-Point Method for Large-Scale l1-Regularized Least Squares. *Selected Topics in Signal Processing, IEEE Journal of*, 1: 606–617, 2008.

V. Koltchinskii. *Oracle Inequalities in Empirical Risk Minimization and Sparse Recovery Problems: École DÉté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXVIII-2008*. Ecole d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour. Springer, 2011. ISBN 9783642221460.

Anastasios T. Kyrillidis and Volkan Cevher. Combinatorial selection and least absolute shrinkage via the clash algorithm. In *ISIT*, pages 2216–2220, 2012.

Anastasios T. Kyrillidis and Volkan Cevher. Matrix recipes for hard thresholding methods. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 48(2):235–265, 2014.

S.G. Mallat and Zhifeng Zhang. Matching pursuits with time-frequency dictionaries. *Trans. Sig. Proc.*, 41:3397–3415, 1993. ISSN 1053-587X.

Nicolai Meinshausen and Peter Bühlmann. High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the lasso. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34(3):1436–1462, 2006.

Deanna Needell and Joel A. Tropp. Cosamp: Iterative signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate samples. *Commun. ACM*, 53:93–100, 2010. ISSN 0001-0782.

Deanna Needell and Roman Vershynin. Uniform uncertainty principle and signal recovery via regularized orthogonal matching pursuit. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 9:317–334, 2009. ISSN 1615-3375.

Jelani Nelson. Johnson-lindenstrauss notes. Technical report, 2013.

Yu. Nesterov. Gradient methods for minimizing composite objective function. Core discussion papers, Universit catholique de Louvain, Center for Operations Research and Econometrics (CORE), 2007.

M. R. Osborne, B. Presnell, and B. A. Turlach. A new approach to variable selection in least squares problems. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 20:389–403, 2000. ISSN 1464-3642.

Michael R. Osborne, Brett Presnell, and Berwin A. Turlach. On the lasso and its dual. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 9:319–337, 1999.

Yaniv Plan and Roman Vershynin. One-bit compressed sensing by linear programming. *CoRR*, abs/1109.4299, 2011.

M.M. Rao and Z.D. Ren. *Theory of Orlicz Spaces*. Chapman and Hall Pure and Applied Mathematics. CRC Press, 1991. ISBN 978-0824784782.

R. Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (Series B)*, 58:267–288, 1996.

J. A. Tropp. Greed is good: Algorithmic results for sparse approximation. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor.*, 50:2231–2242, 2006a. ISSN 0018-9448.

Joel A. Tropp. Just relax: convex programming methods for identifying sparse signals in noise. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52:1030–1051, 2006b.

Joel A. Tropp and Anna C. Gilbert. Signal recovery from random measurements via orthogonal matching pursuit. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 53:4655–4666, 2007.

P. Tseng. On accelerated proximal gradient methods for convex-concave optimization. *submitted to SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 2008.

Berwin A. Turlach, William N. Venables, and Stephen J. Wright. Simultaneous variable selection. *Technometrics*, 47:349–363, 2005.

Sara A. van de Geer and Peter Bühlmann. On the conditions used to prove oracle results for the lasso. *Electron. J. Statist.*, 3:1360–1392, 2009.

Martin J. Wainwright. Sharp thresholds for high-dimensional and noisy sparsity recovery using l1-constrained quadratic programming (lasso). *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor.*, 55:2183–2202, 2009.

Lin Xiao and Tong Zhang. A proximal-gradient homotopy method for the sparse least-squares problem. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(2):1062–1091, 2013.

Cun-Hui Zhang and Jian Huang. The sparsity and bias of the lasso selection in high-dimensional linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36:1567–1594, 2008.

Tong Zhang. Some sharp performance bounds for least squares regression with l1 regularization. *Ann. Statist.*, 37:2109–2144, 2009.

Peng Zhao and Bin Yu. On model selection consistency of lasso. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 7:2541–2563, 2006.